INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Club Z! Tutoring Services

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERV	ATION	COMPLIANCE		
		Lesson matches		Criminal Background		
		original description	Meeting Standard	Checks		
Tutor Qualifications	Unsatisfactory		(3)		In Compliance	
			Meeting Standard	Health/safety laws &		
Recruiting Materials	Satisfactory	Instruction is clear	(3)	regulations	In Compliance	
		Time on task is	Meeting Standard			
Academic Program	Satisfactory	appropriate	(3)	Financial viability	In Compliance	
		Instructor is				
		appropriately	Meeting Standard			
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	knowledgeable	(3)			
Assessment and Individual		Student/instructor	Meeting Standard			
Program Design	Satisfactory	ratio: 4:1, 7:1, 7:1, 8:1	(3)			

ACTION NEEDED:

Club Z! submitted an action plan to ensure that all tutors will meet Club Z! tutor qualifications (certified teachers or degreed professionals with education experience).

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Club Z! Tutoring Services

REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 1/03/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

		DOCUMENTATION			
		SUBMITTED	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	
COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	(IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORT	SATISFACTORI	COMMENTS
	BOTH of the following:				Resumes/tutor applications indicate that
	-Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>)				some tutors are certified teachers and
	-Documentation of professional				some are degreed professionals with
	development opportunities in which tutors				education experience, as described in
	have participated (i.e. sign-sheets,				Club Z!'s application. However, some
	agendas, presentations, certificates of				tutors, while degreed, do not appear to
	completion, etc.)				possess any education experience at all,
					which goes against Club Z!'s description
	In addition to:				that all tutors are "highly qualified,"
	ONE of the following:				skilled educators who are certified
	-Tutor evaluations (all tutors)				teachers or degreed professionals."
	-Recruiting policy for tutors (one copy)				Power Point presentation of tutor training
Tutor qualifications	-Sample tutor contract (one copy)				and agenda for training in Anderson and
4	(<u>======</u>)				Indianapolis was provided. Presentation
					was thorough and covered AYP, the Club
					Z! program, safety rules and regulations,
					tutor expectations, and ideas for
					differentiating instruction.
					Club Z! tutor assurances include a
		Tutor applications			sentence noting that tutors have read and
		and resumes			understand the training materials.
		Tutor recruitment			Club Z! tutor handbook and Power Point
		information			presentation for training in northern
		Tutor handbook			Indiana was provided.
		Documentation of			Tutor handbook covers information such
		prof. development			as student assessment processes,
		Tutor evaluation			development of student learning plans,
		rubric	₹7		and progress monitoring.
			X		Tutor evaluation rubric monitors student

					participation, representation of content, structure and pacing, and response to students' individual needs.
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	 Recruitment flyer Incentive policy Program description for parents 		X	Recruitment flyer describes some of the services offered by the provider. Incentive policy and practice is appropriate for IDOE's currently approved incentives policy. Program description describes both one-to-one, in-home tutoring and small and large group in-school and off-site tutoring. Program description matches lessons observed and the provider's original and amended application.
Academic Program	ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors In addition to: ONE of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	 Lesson plans for Abraham Lincoln Elementary Description of connections to curriculum Individual student lesson plans for IPS, Western Wayne, Seymour, and Franklin County 		X	 Lesson plans were provided for reading and math at Abraham Lincoln Elementary (grade 3). The lesson plans include student objectives and goals for the lesson, as well as standards and substandards to be addressed. The lesson plan also include specific resources and steps to achieve lesson objectives. Worksheets to be used with students based on pre-test were provided for students in IPS and Western Wayne. Packets, as well as diagnostic assessment information and skills to be covered were sent for Seymour and Franklin County. Worksheets include lesson objectives, materials needed, and variations for tutors. A math and language arts calendar for standards (which was created after consultation with school districts) was provided.
	ALL of the following:	Sample progress reports Timeline for progress report submission			Progress reports include month, student name, tutor, school, grade, and pre-test scores. They also include reading and language arts and math standards to be covered, as well as level of mastery of
	-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the	Documentation of progress report submission in	X		those standards. Finally, the progress report allows for additional teacher comments. The provider also sends parents a guide for how to interpret the

Progress Reporting	request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent ALL of the following:	MSD Perry Township • Explanation of		progress report. While the submitted progress reports are acceptable (as they are from December of 2007), changes should be made to ensure that progress reports (after January 1, 2008) include information required in the IDOE progress report checklist. Specifically, the revised progress report must include: • Student goals from the SES agreement • A written statement regarding how parents can provide feedback on how the progress report could be improved • Actual pre-test score (including breakdowns by standard, where appropriate)—while the progress reports submitted had a line for pre-test score, none of the pre-test scores were filled out. • Additionally, the current progress report lists standards that are "not applicable" to the particular student or the particular month. It would likely be more parent-friendly to ensure that progress reports only include standards that that student in particular is working on. • A progress report submission record was sent by the provider for MSD Perry Township indicating that progress reports are being submitted on a monthly basis (in compliance with the district contract). • Based on school district surveys, two of three school districts surveyed indicated that progress reports have been submitted on time. However, one school district indicated that progress reports have never been submitted, despite multiple attempts. Club Z! must ensure that progress reports will be submitted in a timely manner in all districts.
	-Explanation of the process provider uses	the process used to develop individual		and included specific worksheets/assignments/activities identified based on the learning plan
	to develop Individual learning plans for each student	individual learning plans	X	identified based on the learning plan.Individual learning plan submitted for
	Cacii studelit	icarning plans	Λ	- marviduai icarining pian submitted for

	- Pre-assessment scores and Individual	Sample	MSD Perry includes pre-test scores in
	learning plan for at least one student in	individual	both subjects, as well as areas of
	each subject provider tutors (any	learning plans	instruction (specific standards) that will
	identifying information for the student(s)	for MSD Perry	be the subject of instructional focus. The
	must be blanked out)	Township, IPS,	learning plan includes specific goals for
Assessment and	-Explanation and evidence regarding how	and Western	student progress, as well as percentage
Individual Program	provider's pre and post-test assessment	Wayne	increases expected on the post-test. The
Design	correlates to Indiana academic standards.	Explanation of	plan includes strategies and methods that
		assessment's	will be used to address goals and
		connection to	individualize for each student.
		standards	 Sample plans submitted for IPS and
			Western Wayne (SES agreements)
			included goals and standards to be
			addressed in tutoring. While some goals
			were clear (increase by .25 grade level
			equivalent), others were vague (i.e.,
			"objectives are math and language arts
			based and match ISTEP+").
			Sample plans for IPS and Western Wayne
			did not include specific strategies for
			addressing goals. It is recommended that
			individual learning plans are consistent
			across sites and that all include specific
			strategies for attaining goals, in addition
			to specific, measurable goals and pre- and
			post-test scores, as well as standards to be
			covered.
			GMADE, GRADE, and KTEAII are used
			as pre- and post-assessments.
			Assessments diagnose essential elements
			of reading and cover content and process
			standards of math. Assessments are used
			to diagnose skill gaps in these areas and
			to develop achievement goals. Sample
			activities from GMADE and GRADE
			were provided to demonstrate connections
			with Indiana Academic Standards.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Club Z! Tutoring Services

SITE: Abraham Lincoln Elementary (MSD Perry Township)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 5 tutors (Media Center,

Rms. 200, 202, 207, 209)

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 5

DATE: 12/10/07

REVIEWER: M.C., S.T

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:15PM-4:30PM, 5:00PM-5:30PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

	1	2	3	4	
COMPONENT	Below Standard	Approaching Standard	Meeting Standard	Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		Lessons observed appeared to be connected with the work covered by students during their regular school day. All tutors had lesson plans that included clear objectives, standards to be covered, and methods to cover the standards in that lesson. Lessons were generally age-appropriate. Tutors followed their lesson plans for each lesson observed. Although individualized instruction was not evident at all times, in most lessons tutors paid attention to individual skill levels and tried to ensure that each student understood the concept being covered. Tutors occasionally provided individual instruction to students or worked independently with students who had lower academic ability or who appeared confused with a concept. The original and amended applications, as well as corrective action submitted in 2006-2007 indicate that lessons provided will mirror what students are doing in the traditional classroom, as well as be individualized. Lessons observed generally matched this description.
Instruction is clear			X		In most cases, students appeared to understand what was expected of them and what they were supposed to be working on. In all observed lessons, tutors introduced the topic and guided students through activities to meet lesson objectives. Lessons had clear intent and objectives and were clearly planned out by the tutors prior to the lessons beginning. Students appeared to understand lesson objectives. Lessons and activities conducted in the lessons appeared to be generally well organized and based around the lesson objectives. Each tutor had a lesson plan that described the standards to be covered as

			Tu to wh the les	ell as lesson objectives, along with strategies to be utilized to achieve those objectives. Lators followed lesson plans in each lesson observed. In many lessons, tutors attempted connect what students were learning with what they had covered previously or with hat is on the ISTEP+ test. Students generally appeared to know what was expected of em. In rare cases, students became somewhat confused when rotating to a different sson, making transitions, or toward the end of the tutoring session; however, tutors enerally were capable of instructing students to ensure that they developed inderstanding.
Time on task is appropriate		X	mo and wo to roo qu a f	udents were generally on task and seemed to enjoy what they were working on. In ost lessons, tutors did a nice job of working individually with students when necessary and redirecting students who might have gotten off task. In one classroom, the tutor orked with students identifying appropriate vocabulary words. Although the students orked in a large group, the tutor ensured that all students participated by asking students call out answers and occasionally calling on students who were quiet. In another om, a tutor rotated between students working at stations, answering individual nestions, providing instruction, and ensuring all students were on task. There were only few instances of students not being on task (especially toward the end of the tutoring ssion, in larger groups, or for students who were working independently)—in those uses, the tutors generally tried to walk around to each student and get them back on task.
Instructor is appropriately			In stu ah	each classroom, tutors had student folders, lesson plans, and learning plans for udents. Tutors followed lesson plans very closely. Tutors had clearly planned lessons lead of time, had clear objectives, and insured that students were aware of what the sson objectives should be. All tutors had lesson plans readily available.
knowledgeable		X	we mi tut an we wi	ators appeared familiar with each student's individual ability level, and in some cases ould work independently with one or two students on a particular concept that they ight be struggling with. In classrooms where students were working independently, tors seemed aware of what students were covering and provided appropriate instruction ad connection to concepts. In a few cases, tutors struggled to ensure that all students ere receiving immediate attention when requested; however, once they began working ith the students, they generally implemented appropriate techniques to ensure that udents understood concepts.
Student/instructor ratio: 4:1, 7:1, 8:1 Ratio matches that				•
reported in original provider				
application		X	Ra	atio meets that provided in amended application.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Club Z! Tutoring Services

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 1/03/08

REVIEWER: MC

The following information is rated "Compliance" (C) or "Non-Compliance" (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

		DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED		
COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	(IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
	ALL of the following:			
Criminal background checks	-Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	Criminal background checks were submitted for all tutors.	X	
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) In addition to: ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	 Student release policy Teacher/tutor portfolio including emergency building information Student sign-in/sign-out sheet Club Z! safety rules and regulations Transportation policy 	X	
Financial viability	ONE of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage In addition to: ONE of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	 Certificate of liability insurance Audited financial statements 	X	